

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*(HO)*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/265,363	03/10/99	ARAI	I 520.32696CX3
020457		LM01/0316	EXAMINER
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS SUITE 1800 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209		PHAN, R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2781	7
		DATE MAILED:	03/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/265,363Applica
Arai et al.

Examiner

Raymond N. Phan

Group Art Unit
2781

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 28, 1999

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-26 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on December 28, 1999.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 15-26 have been added.

Specification

3. The new title of the invention is accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 18, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 18 (page 6), claim 20 (page 7), using the phrase, "...the same transmission cable...", lacks proper antecedent basis and causes the claim to be vague and indefinite.

As per claim 22 (page 8), claim 24 (page 8), using the phrase, "...said computer starts...", lacks proper antecedent basis and causes the claim to be vague and indefinite.

5. The remaining claims, not specifically mentioned, are rejected for incorporating the defects from the parent claim by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-8 and 10-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawdon (US No. 5,276,458) in view of Hibino et al. (US No. 5,599,231).

In regards to claims 1, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25-26, Sawdon a display system comprising a communication circuit 97 for communicating with an externally connected computer (see figure 1, col. 2, lines 57-67) wherein the communication circuit is having memory 11 contains identification code for the display system (see col. 3, lines 45-60). But Sawdon do not disclose the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means. However Hibino et al. disclose the security systems and methods for a video graphics computer system and authentication game/program fabricating device comprising: a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the identification device and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent

from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the control (i.e. copy, edit) of the system, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means (see col 21, line 57 through col. 22, line 28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hibino et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would prevent the unauthorized use of the video graphics computer system.

In regards to claims 2, 8, 11, and 14, Sawdon teach the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the use of first identification stored in the memory of the display unit. However Hibino et al. disclose first identification stored in the memory (i.e. removable disk drive) (see col. 22, lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hibino et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would provide a unique comparison in security system of the video graphics computer system.

In regards to claim 3, Sawdon teach the claimed subject matter as discussed above except the use of communication prohibition means for prohibiting communication between the computer with respect to display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification informations do not match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means. However Hibino et al. disclose communication prohibition means for prohibiting communication between the computer with respect to control (i.e. copy, edit) of the system, when the first and second identification informations do not match as a result of the comparison by the

comparing means (see col. 21, line 57 through col. 22, line 28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hibino et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would prevent the unauthorized use of the video graphics computer system.

In regards to claim 4, in addition to the rejection of claim 1, Sawdon disclose the reception permission means for permitting reception of the control command for controlling at least a display size/position of the display unit from the computer (see col. 9, lines 6-37).

In regards to claim 5, Sawdon further disclose the control command including information for controlling a display brightness/contrast (see col. 1, lines 5-15).

In regards to claims 6-7, Sawdon further disclose the control command is generated within the computer, based upon a command inputted from an input means (i.e keyboard) connected to the computer (see col. 1, lines 1-15).

In regards to claim 13, Sawdon disclose the control data is written in the memory device (see col. 7, lines 46-57).

In regards to claims 15-16, even though the teachings of Sawdon and Hibino et al. do not specifically disclose the use of memory means for storing at least data of a frequency range to which the display unit is operable, however one skilled in the art would have understood that they can choose to have memory device (i.e. RAM or ROM) for storing at least data of a frequency range to which the display unit is operable to fulfill their need.

In regard to claims 18 and 20, Sawdon discloses the information is transmitted between the computer and display system via serial link (see figure 1, col. 3, lines 6-16).

In regard to claim 22 and 24, Sawdon and Hibino et al. fail to teach the identification number is recognize by the computer at start up. "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and the advantage of recognizing the identification number at the computer startup are well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to include the computer recognizing the identification number at startup to the system of Sawdon or Hibino et al. to provide the integrity of the system.

Examiner suggests the applicant(s) to carefully study the entire teachings of Sawdon. and Hibino et al. references. Examiner relies on the entire teachings of references.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 9 is allowable over the prior of records.

Response to Amendment

9. Applicant's amendment and arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and new claims 15-26 have been considered but claims 1-14 and new claims 15-26 are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Response to Arguments

10. In view of arguments filed on December 28, 1999, the arguments on the Hibino reference have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Hibino reference fail to disclose the display unit and external computer, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

11. Claims 1-8 and 10-26 are rejected. Claim 9 is allowed.
12. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kerigan et al. (US No. 5,948,091) disclose an universal digital display device.

Sartore et al. (US No. 6,012,103) disclose a bus interface system and method.

Shipman (US No. 5,909,592) discloses a method in a basic input/output system (BIOS) of detecting and configuring interface device electronics (IDE) devices.

Monnes et al. (US No. 5,375,210) disclose a display mode query and set.

Monhan et al. (US No. 5,896,546) discloses a "sticky" logical drive letter assignments.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays during the same hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ayaz Sheikh*, can be reached on (703) 305-9648 or via e-mail addressed to [ayza.sheikh@uspto.gov]. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-5358.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Raymond Phan

Mar 10, 2000